UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,184	09/17/2003	Dean A. Klein	MTIPAT.046D1C1	8768

20995 7590 11/30/2007

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER	
SCHNURR, JOHN R	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/30/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com
eOAPilot@kmob.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/666,184	KLEIN, DEAN A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John R. Schnurr	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 September 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-51* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-51* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *17 September 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *12/19/2003*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to Application No. 10/666,184 filed 09/17/2003. Claims 1-51 are pending and have been examined.

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 12/19/2003 was considered by the examiner.

Double Patenting

3. Claims **1-51** are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 6-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,637,030. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are different definitions or descriptions of the same subject matter varying in breadth. For example, note the following relationship between the instant application and the patented claims.

a) the preamble of claim 1, a network bus, corresponds to the local area network (line 1) of patented claim 6;

b) the claimed notch filter (line 2) of application claim 1 corresponds to the notch filter (line 2) of patented claim 6;

c) the claimed tree configuration (lines 2-3) of application claim 1 corresponds to the unlooped cable television wire (line 7) of patented claim 6.

d) the frequency converter (line 5) of application claim 1 corresponds to the frequency converter (line 2) of patented claim 8; and

e) the first and second frequencies being within the filtered out portion (lines 7-8) of the application claim 1 corresponds to the carrier having a frequency within the filtered out portion (lines 19-21) of the patented claim 6.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to readily recognize that the conflicting claims are different definitions or descriptions of the same subject

matter varying in breadth. In this case, the application claims are broader and inclusive to the patented claims.

Additionally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the patented invention to include a coaxial cable because it is the most readily available and widely used transmission medium to transport audio and video signals.

Claim 2 of the application corresponds to claim 8 (line 2) of the patent.

Claims 3, 18 and 21 of the application correspond to claim 12 (line 9) of the patent.

Claims 4 and 23 of the application correspond to claim 6 (line 2-3) of the patent.

Claims 5, 24 and 38 of the application correspond to claim 6 (line 5) of the patent.

Claims 6, 13, 20, 34 and 42 of the application correspond to claim 8 (inclusive of claims 6 and 7) of the patent.

Claim 7 of the application corresponds to claim 6 (line 25) of the patent.

Claims 8, 35 and 48 of the application correspond to claim 7 of the patent.

Claim 9 of the application corresponds to claim 8 of the patent.

Claims 10 and 36 of the application correspond to claim 9 of the patent.

Claims 11 and 37 of the application correspond to claim 10 of the patent.

Claims 12 and 44 of the application correspond to claim 11 of the patent.

Claims 14 and 43 of the application correspond to claim 6 (lines 10-16) of the patent.

Claims 15, 16, 22, 29-33, 39, 40, 41, 47, 50 and 51 of the application correspond to claim 12 (line 10) of the patent.

Claim 17 of the application corresponds to claim 6 (line 5) of the patent.

Claims 19, 26, 28, and 49 of the application correspond to claim 6 (lines 17-21) of the patent.

Claim 25 of the application corresponds to claim 6 (lines 2-6) of the patent.

Claim 27 of the application corresponds to claim 6 (line 5) of the patent.

Claim 45 of the application corresponds to claim 6 (line 7) of the patent.

Claim 46 of the application corresponds to claim 6 (line 7-8) of the patent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims **1-6, 13, 15-33, 42 and 45-51** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Freedman (US Patent 6,288,749)** in view of **Decker et al. (US Patent 6,009,465)**, herein Decker.

Consider **claim 1**, Freedman clearly teaches a network bus comprising:

> a notch filter coupled to a cable, **(Fig. 1: Signal converted 20 contains a notch filter, column 3 lines 52-62.)** said cable routed in a tree configuration to a plurality of locations of a building, **(Fig. 1: The plurality of locations in Fig. 1 are in a tree configuration and the locations are in the same building, column 3 lines 63-67.)** said notch filter configured to filter out a portion of video signals carried by said cable; **(column 3 lines 52-62)**
>
> a frequency converter, coupled to said cable, configured to receive signals from said cable at a first frequency and to forward said signals at a second frequency, wherein said first and second frequencies are within said filtered out portion. **(The output from computer 10 is converted to the filtered television frequency and transmitted to the televisions, column 4 lines 22-30.)**

However, Freedman does not explicitly teach said cable is a coaxial cable.

In an analogous art, Decker, which discloses a system for a local area network wherein filtered signals are displayed on a television set, clearly teaches the use of coaxial cable to transmit data. **(column 5 lines 1-2)**

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Freedman by using coaxial cable, as taught by Decker, because both references teach methods of distributing data in a network it would have been obvious to substitute one cable type for another to achieve the predictable result of transmitting data.

Consider **claim 2**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 1, clearly teaches said frequency converter is configured to forward said signals via said coaxial cable. **(The output from computer 10 is converted to the filtered television frequency and transmitted to the televisions, column 4 lines 22-30 Freedman.)**

Consider **claim 3**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 1, clearly teaches said building comprises a residential building. **(Any type of building may be used, column 3 lines 63-67 Freedman.)**

Consider **claim 4**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 1, clearly teaches said video signals are delivered to said coaxial cable from a headend equipment of a community antenna television system. **(column 3 lines 23-25 Freedman)**

Consider **claim 5**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 1, clearly teaches said filtered out portion comprises a frequency range from approximately 50MHz to approximately 750MHz. **(The notch filter filters out a television channel, column 3 lines 52-62 Freedman.)**

Consider **claim 6**, Freedman clearly teaches a local area network comprising:

> a notch filter configured to receive a signal from a cable television transmission system **(column 3 lines 23-25 Freedman)** and to filter out a portion of said signal in the range of approximately 50 MHz to approximately 750 MHz to produce a filtered signal; **(Fig. 1: Signal converted 20 contains a notch filter, which filters out a television channel, column 3 lines 52-62.)**
>
> a community antenna television wire configured to receive said filtered signal and routed in a tree configuration to a plurality of locations of a

residence, said wire coupled to said notch filter; **(Fig. 1: The plurality of locations in Fig. 1 are in a tree configuration and the locations are in the same building, column 3 lines 63-67.)**

Freedman further teaches messages may be transmitted between the television sets in the filtered frequencies. **(column 4 lines 28-30)** To accomplish this data must be modulated and demodulated by the television sets.

However, Freedman does not explicitly teach a plurality of computers coupled to said wire.

In an analogous art, Decker, which discloses a system for a local area network wherein filtered signals are displayed on a television set, clearly teaches a plurality of computers coupled to said wire. **(column 12 lines 16-23)**

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Freedman by utilizing a plurality of computers coupled to said wire, as taught by Decker, for the benefit of providing the user with added interactive functionality.

Consider **claim 13**, Freedman clearly teaches a local area network comprising:

routing community antenna television wiring in a tree configuration to different parts of a structure; **(Fig. 1: Data from broadcast source 100 is routed in a tree configuration to televisions 30 located within a structure, column 3 lines 23-25; lines 62-67.)**

coupling a notch filter to said wiring for filtering out one or more television broadcasts delivered to said wiring by a service drop of a community antenna television distribution system; ; **(Fig. 1: Signal converted 20 contains a notch filter, which filters out a television channel, column 3 lines 52-62.)**

Freedman further teaches messages may be transmitted between the television sets in the filtered frequencies. **(column 4 lines 28-30)** To accomplish this data must be modulated and demodulated by the television sets.

However, Freedman does not explicitly teach a plurality of computers coupled to said wire.

In an analogous art, Decker, which discloses a system for a local area network wherein filtered signals are displayed on a television set, clearly teaches a plurality of computers coupled to said wire. **(column 12 lines 16-19 Decker)**

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Freedman by utilizing a plurality of computers coupled to said wire, as taught by Decker, for the benefit of providing the user with added interactive functionality.

Consider **claim 15**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 13, clearly teaches computing devices comprise a computer and a microprocessor controlled appliance. **(column 12 lines 16-23)**

Consider **claim 16**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 13, clearly teaches said computing devices comprise an alarm system. **(Any device capable of transmitting sensory data may be used, column 12 lines 16-19 Decker.)**

Consider **claim 17**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 13, clearly teaches said filtered out television broadcasts comprise a portion of the frequency range between approximately 50 MHz to 750 MHz. **(Television channels are located in the range of 50-750 MHz.)**

Consider **claim 18**, see claim 3.

Consider **claim 19**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 13, clearly teaches at least some of said computing devices transmit communications at a first frequency and receive communications at a second frequency, wherein said first and second frequency are within said filtered out television broadcasts. **(Television sets 30 receive signals modulated at a television channel frequency and may communicate with each other, column 4 lines 22-30 Freedman.)**

Consider **claim 20**, Freedman clearly teaches a local area network comprising:

coupling a notch filter to wiring carrying television signals, wherein the coaxial wiring is routed in a tree configuration to a plurality of locations in a building; **(Fig. 1: Data from broadcast source 100 is sent to Signal converted 20, which contains a notch filter, then routed in a tree configuration to televisions 30 located within a structure, column 3 lines 23-25; lines 62-67.)**

filtering out a frequency band comprising a portion of said television signals with the notch filter; **(column 3 lines 52-62)**

establishing two-way communications between at least two computing devices, wherein said communications are carried at least in part over said wiring utilizing said frequency band. **(column 4 lines 28-30)**

However, Freedman does not explicitly teach said cable is a coaxial cable.

In an analogous art, Decker, which discloses a system for a local area network wherein filtered signals are displayed on a television set, clearly teaches the use of coaxial cable to transmit data. **(column 5 lines 1-2)**

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Freedman by using coaxial cable, as taught by Decker, because both references teach methods of distributing data in a network it would have been obvious to substitute one cable type for another to achieve the predictable result of transmitting data.

Consider **claims 21 and 22**, see claim 3.

Consider **claim 23**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 20, clearly teaches said television signals are delivered to said building via a service drop of a community antenna television system. **(column 3 lines 23-25 Freedman)**

Consider **claim 24**, see claim 17.

Consider **claim 25**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 20, clearly teaches blocking at least some of said communications from being transmitted outside said local area network via said service drop. **(Fig. 1: Signal converter 20 contains a comb filter 61 Freedman.)**

Consider **claim 26**, see claim 19.

Consider **claim 27**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 20, clearly teaches providing a frequency converter configured to receive said communications at said first frequency and to forward said communications at said second frequency. **(Fig. 1: Signal converter 20 converts signals from one frequency to another frequency, column 3 lines 37-41 Freedman.)**

Consider **claim 28**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 20, clearly teaches one of the computing devices sends a communication to another of the computing devices at a first frequency, and wherein said another computing device receives said communication at a second frequency. **(Computing devices receive data on a channel frequency and transmit data via a separate frequency, column 4 lines 22-30 Freedman.)**

Consider **claim 29**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 20, clearly teaches the method of claim 23.

However, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 20, does not explicitly teach said computing devices comprise a network computer.

In an analogous art, Decker, which discloses a system for a local area network wherein filtered signals are displayed on a television set, clearly teaches said computing devices comprise a network computer. **(column 12 lines 16-19 Decker)**

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Freedman by utilizing a plurality of computers coupled to said wire, as taught by Decker, for the benefit of providing the user with added interactive functionality.

Consider **claim 30**, see claim 29.

Consider **claim 31**, see claim 16.

Consider **claim 32**, see claim 29.

Consider **claim 33**, see claims 30-32.

Consider **claim 42**, Freedman clearly teaches a local area network comprising:

> receiving a television signal from a headend transmission equipment of a cable television transmission system; **(Fig. 1: Data from broadcast source 100 is routed to televisions 30, column 3 lines 23-25.)**
>
> filtering out a portion of said television signal in the range of approximately 50 MHz to approximately 750 MHz to produce a filtered signal; **(Fig. 1: Signal converted 20 contains a notch filter, which filters out a television channel, column 3 lines 52-62.)**
>
> coupling said filtered signal to unlooped cable television wiring; **(Fig. 1: Data from broadcast source 100 is routed in a tree configuration to televisions 30, column 3 lines 23-25.)**

Freedman further teaches messages may be transmitted between the television sets in the filtered frequencies. **(column 4 lines 28-30)** To accomplish this data must be modulated and demodulated by the television sets.

However, Freedman does not explicitly teach a plurality of computers coupled to said wire.

In an analogous art, Decker, which discloses a system for a local area network wherein filtered signals are displayed on a television set, clearly teaches a plurality of computers coupled to said wire. **(column 12 lines 16-19 Decker)**

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Freedman by utilizing a plurality of computers coupled to said wire, as taught by Decker, for the benefit of providing the user with added interactive functionality.

Consider **claim 45**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 42, clearly teaches said building comprises a residential building. **(Any type of building may be used, column 3 lines 63-67 Freedman.)**

Consider **claim 46**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 42, clearly teaches a local area network.

However, Freedman and Decker do not explicitly teach said cable is a coaxial cable.

In an analogous art, Decker, which discloses a system for a local area network wherein filtered signals are displayed on a television set, clearly teaches the use of coaxial cable to transmit data. **(column 5 lines 1-2)**

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Freedman by using coaxial cable, as taught by Decker, because both references teach methods of distributing data in a network it would have been obvious to substitute one cable type for another to achieve the predictable result of transmitting data.

Consider **claim 47**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 42, clearly teaches said computing devices comprise a network computer. **(column 12 lines 16-19 Decker)**

Consider **claim 48**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 20, clearly teaches said modem in configured to receive communications at a first frequency and to send communications at a second frequency. **(Computing devices receive data on a channel frequency and transmit data via a separate frequency, column 4 lines 22-30 Freedman.)**

Consider **claim 49**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 42, clearly teaches coupling a frequency converter to said wiring, wherein said frequency converter receives a communication at a first frequency and forwards said communication at a second frequency. **(Fig. 1: Signal converter 20 converts**

signals from one frequency to another frequency, column 3 lines 37-41 Freedman.)

Consider **claim 50**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 42, clearly teaches said computing devices comprise a personal computer. **(column 12 lines 16-19 Decker)**

Consider **claim 51**, see claim 50.

3. Claims **7-9, 12, 14, 34, 35, 38-41, 43 and 44** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Freedman (US Patent 6,288,749)** in view of **Decker et al. (US Patent 6,009,465)**, as applied to claims 6, 13 and 42 above, and further in view of **Coutinho (US Patent 5,760,822)**.

Consider **claim 7**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 6, clearly teaches personal computers sending signals over a network.

However, Freedman and Decker do not explicitly teach communicating an upstream, message using a carrier frequency in the range of 0-50 MHz.

In an analogous art, Coutinho, which discloses a system for transmitting data to a local in-building network, clearly teaches using a carrier frequency in the range of 6-11 MHz, which is in the claim 0-50 MHz. **(column 5 lines 23-50)**

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Freedman and Decker by communicating an upstream, message using a carrier frequency in the range of 0-50 MHz, as taught by Coutinho, for the benefit of providing a means for the user to communicate with the headend.

Consider **claim 8**, Freedman combined with Decker and Coutinho, as in claim 7, clearly teaches said modem is configured to receive a signal at a first frequency and to transmit said signal at a second frequency. **(Television sets 30 receive signals modulated at a television channel frequency and may communicate with each other, column 4 lines 22-30 Freedman.)**

Consider **claim 9**, Freedman combined with Decker and Coutinho, as in claim 7, clearly teaches a frequency converter configured to convert signals from said first frequency to said second frequency. **(Fig. 1: Signal converter 20 converts**

signals from one frequency to another frequency, column 3 lines 37-41 Freedman.)

Consider **claim 12**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 6, clearly teaches personal computers sending signals over a network.

However, Freedman and Decker do not explicitly teach communicating an upstream, message using a carrier frequency in the range of 0-50 MHz.

In an analogous art, Coutinho, which discloses a system for transmitting data to a local in-building network, clearly teaches using a carrier frequency in the range of 6-11 MHz, which is in the claim 0-50 MHz. **(column 5 lines 23-50)**

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Freedman and Decker by communicating an upstream, message using a carrier frequency in the range of 0-50 MHz, as taught by Coutinho, for the benefit of providing a means for the user to communicate with the headend.

Consider **claim 14**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 13, clearly teaches each of at least some of said computing devices comprises a receiver configured to receive video signals from said headend transmission equipment, **(column 3 lines 23-25)** and a modem configured to receive and transmit broadband signals between said computing devices. **(column 4 lines 28-30)**

However, Freedman and Decker do not explicitly teach a transmitter for forwarding signals to said headend transmission equipment.

In an analogous art, Coutinho, which discloses a system for transmitting data to a local in-building network, clearly teaches a transmitter for forwarding signals to said headend transmission equipment. **(column 5 lines 23-50)**

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Freedman and Decker by communicating an upstream message, as taught by Coutinho, for the benefit of providing a means for the user to communicate with the headend.

Consider **claim 34**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 1, clearly teaches a network device comprising:

> a receiver for receiving a television signal from a community antenna television system; **(Fig. 1: Signal converter 20 receives a signal from a broadcast source, column 3 lines 25-25 Freedman.)**

a modem configured to receive and transmit broadband signals between computing devices. **(column 4 lines 28-30 Freedman)**

However, Freedman and Decker do not explicitly teach a transmitter for forwarding signals to said headend transmission equipment.

In an analogous art, Coutinho, which discloses a system for transmitting data to a local in-building network, clearly teaches a transmitter for forwarding signals to said headend transmission equipment. **(column 5 lines 23-50)**

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Freedman and Decker by communicating an upstream message, as taught by Coutinho, for the benefit of providing a means for the user to communicate with the headend.

Consider **claim 35**, Freedman combined with Decker and Coutinho, as in claim 34, clearly teaches said modem is configured to receive signals at a first frequency and to transmit said signals at a second frequency. **(Computing devices receive data on a channel frequency and transmit data via a separate frequency, column 4 lines 22-30 Freedman.)**

Consider **claim 38**, Freedman combined with Decker and Coutinho, as in claim 34, clearly said receiver is configured to receive signals in the range of approximately 50 to 750 MHz. **(Television channels are located in the range of 50-750 MHz.)**

Consider **claim 39**, Freedman combined with Decker and Coutinho, as in claim 34, clearly teaches the method of claim 34.

However, Freedman combined with Decker and Coutinho, as in claim 34, does not explicitly teach said computing devices comprise a microprocessor-controlled appliance.

In an analogous art, Decker, which discloses a system for a local area network wherein filtered signals are displayed on a television set, clearly teaches said computing devices comprise a microprocessor controlled appliance. **(column 12 lines 16-19 Decker)**

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Freedman by utilizing a microprocessor controlled appliance, as taught by Decker, for the benefit of providing the user with added interactive functionality.

Consider **claim 40**, see claim 39.

Consider **claim 41**, see claim 39.

Consider **claim 43**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 42, clearly teaches each of at least some of said computing devices comprises a receiver configured to receive video signals from said headend transmission equipment, **(column 3 lines 23-25)**

However, Freedman and Decker do not explicitly teach a transmitter for forwarding signals to said headend transmission equipment.

In an analogous art, Coutinho, which discloses a system for transmitting data to a local in-building network, clearly teaches a transmitter for forwarding signals to said headend transmission equipment. **(column 5 lines 23-50)**

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Freedman and Decker by communicating an upstream message, as taught by Coutinho, for the benefit of providing a means for the user to communicate with the headend.

Consider **claim 44**, Freedman combined with Decker, as in claim 42, clearly teaches personal computers sending signals over a network.

However, Freedman and Decker do not explicitly teach communicating an upstream, message using a carrier frequency in the range of 0-50 MHz.

In an analogous art, Coutinho, which discloses a system for transmitting data to a local in-building network, clearly teaches using a carrier frequency in the range of 6-11 MHz, which is in the claim 0-50 MHz. **(column 5 lines 23-50)**

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Freedman and Decker by communicating an upstream, message using a carrier frequency in the range of 0-50 MHz, as taught by Coutinho, for the benefit of providing a means for the user to communicate with the headend.

4. Claims **10, 11, 36 and 37** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Freedman (US Patent 6,288,749)** in view of **Decker et al. (US Patent 6,009,465)** further in view of **Coutinho (US Patent 5,760,822)**, as applied to

claims 9 and 34 above, and further in view of **Hendricks et al. (US Patent 6,738,978)**, herein Hendricks.

Consider **claims 10 and 36**, Freedman combined with Decker and Coutinho, as in claims 9 and 34 above, clearly teaches a local area network.

However, Freedman combined with Decker and Coutinho do not explicitly teach at least some of said computers are configured to receive digital data from the Internet via said wire.

In an analogous art Hendricks, which discloses a system for distributing television data, clearly teaches at least some of said computers are configured to receive digital data from the Internet via said wire. **(column 49 lines 57-62)**

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Freedman combined with Decker and Coutinho by allowing at least some of said computers are configured to receive digital data from the Internet via said wire, as taught by Hendricks, for the benefit of providing diverse entertainment sources.

Consider **claims 11 and 37**, Freedman combined with Decker and Coutinho, as in claims 9 and 34 above, clearly teaches a local area network.

However, Freedman combined with Decker and Coutinho do not explicitly teach at least some of said computers are configured to receive FM audio signals via said wire.

In an analogous art Hendricks, which discloses a system for distributing television data, clearly teaches at least some of said computers are configured to receive FM audio signals via said wire. **(column 26 lines 37-39)**

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Freedman combined with Decker and Coutinho by allowing at least some of said computers are configured to receive FM audio signals via said wire, as taught by Hendricks, for the benefit of providing diverse entertainment sources.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John R. Schnurr whose telephone number is (571) 270-1458. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Grant can be reached on (571) 272-7294. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JRS

CHRISTOPHER GRANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600